



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/741,316	12/19/2000	Stephen Adachi	CSCO-96301	6172

7590 07/21/2006

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

DAO, MINH D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2618

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/741,316	ADACHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MINH D. DAO	2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,4,13,14,22,31,32,41,49 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-12,15-21,23-30,33-40 and 42-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1,11,21,29,38,48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly-added limitation "close geographical proximity" in the above independent claims is not defined in the specification of the present invention.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1,11,21,29,38,48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant fails to define how close is the "close geographical proximity" of the above independent claims.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 04/27/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument regarding claims 1, 11, 21, 29, 38, 48, that the combination of Rossman, Smith II, Brown, and Devarics does not teach "transmitting information to a facsimile system in close geographical proximity to a mobile device". Examiner disagrees. Since applicant, as mentioned above, fails to define how close is the "close geographical proximity", the combination of Rossman, Smith II, Brown, and Devarics still reads on this newly-added limitation of the above independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made

Art Unit: 2618

2. Claims 1,2, 5-12, 15-21, 23-30, 33-40, 42-47,49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossmann (US 6,405,037) in view of Smith, II et al. (US 2002/0113994), Brown et al. (US 5,524,047).

Regarding claim 1, Rossmann teaches a server system (Fig.1, item 121 or 131 or 141) communicatively coupled to a mobile device (Fig. 1, item 100), a method for retrieving and communicating information, the method comprising: accessing instruction from the mobile device which identifies information (Col. 15, lines 58-67; Col. 16, lines 1-2) by the server system, wherein the information corresponds to data displayed on the mobile device (col. 15, lines 1-57) and comprises one or more of the data and a body of further information related to the data (col. 15, lines 1-57); retrieving the information (Col. 15, lines 6-9); formatting the information into a form compatible with facsimile transmission (Col. 15, 53-57), wherein the formatting is performed by the server system (Col. 15, lines 48-55); and transmitting the information to any facsimile system communicatively accessible with the server system (Col. 15, lines 48-55). In this case, according to Rossmann, once the user receives the purchase order as a card deck from the computer server 121, the user reviews the purchase order and presses the fax key 208. Based on the selection of the fax key 208, the computer server sends the purchase order to the fax gateway. Therefore, it is clear that Rossmann teaches that the actual information being formatted by the fax gateway (in this case, the fax gateway reads on the server system of the present invention because it receives the requested information from the server 121 and converts it to a fax and sends it to the specified telephone number) as facsimile compatible can correspond directly to the data display

on the mobile device. However, Rossmann fails to teach that when the size of the body of further information is greater than is efficiently displayed on the mobile device, then the information is transmitted to a facsimile system functions as an accessible printer device for the mobile device, for printing a hard copy of the information. Smith, in an analogous art, teaches this limitation (see section [0025]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Rossmann so that when the information displayed on the mobile is too big for the mobile device to display, the mobile would then send this information to an accessible printer for the benefit of being able to obtain a hard copy of the information as suggested by Smith. However, Rossmann and Smith, fails to teach printing a hard copy of the information effectively instantaneously as recited in the amended claim. Brown, in an analogous art, teaches a cellular phone capable of receiving fax messages that would be immediately printed out without being required to be stored in a memory (see fig. 6; col. 12, lines 8-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Brown to Rossmann and Smith in order to be able to print an incoming fax message and to efficiently utilize the memory storage.

Regarding claim 2, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the method as recited in Claim 1 further comprising: formatting the information into a form compatible with the mobile device; and sending the information to the mobile device (see Rossmann, Col. 15, lines 6-9).

Regarding claim 5, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the method as recited in Claim 1 wherein the information comprises a webpage and wherein the accessing comprises receiving a Universal Resource Locator (URL) designating the webpage (see Rossmann, Col. 25, lines 20-44).

Regarding claim 6, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the method as recited in Claim 1 wherein the information is selected from a group consisting of: a webpage, a file, a documents, a graphic, a spreadsheet, a database, e-mail, voice-to-text, voice-to-e-mail, (see Rossmann, Col. 25, lines 20-44).

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Rossmann, Smith, and Brown once combined teaches the method as recited in Claim 1 wherein the server system is communicatively coupled to the mobile device via a wireless network (Reference Rossmann, Fig. 1, item 110).

Regarding claim 8, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the method as recited in Claim 7 wherein the wireless network includes the Internet (see Rossmann, Fig. 1, item 140).

Regarding claim 9, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the method as recited in Claim 1 further comprising: receiving a facsimile transmission

Art Unit: 2618

command; and receiving a facsimile (Fax) number wherein the facsimile system is designated as a transmission destination (see Rossmann, Col. 15, lines 18-20).

Regarding claim 10, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the method as recited in Claim 1 wherein the transmitting comprising sending the information to a designated facsimile number (see Rossmann, Col. 15, lines 18-20).

Regarding claim 11, Rossmann teaches a server system comprising: a bus (links between functional blocks 710, 748, 749 and 761 (Fig.7) of Computer Server 131). It is known to those skilled in the art that the hardware structure of Computer Servers 121, 131, 141 of this reference should be similar); a communication interface coupled to the bus, the communication interface (Col. 15, lines 48-52) operable to communicatively couple with a mobile device (Col. 15, lines 6-9) and a facsimile system (Col. 15, lines 48-52); a processor coupled to the bus (Col. 8, lines 41-48); the processor for performing a method of retrieving and communicating information (Col. 15, lines 6-9), the method comprising: accessing an instruction from the mobile device which identifies information (Col. 15, lines 58-67; Col. 16, lines 1-2), wherein the information corresponds to data displayed on the mobile device (col. 15, lines 1-57); retrieving the information (Col. 15, lines 6-9); formatting the information into a form compatible with facsimile transmission (Col. 15, lines 53-57), wherein the formatting is performed by the server system (Col. 15, lines 48-55); and transmitting the information to the facsimile system comprises a facsimile system in close geographical proximity to the mobile

device (Col. 15, lines 48-55). In this case, according to Rossmann, once the user receives the purchase order as a card deck from the computer server 121, the user reviews the purchase order and presses the fax key 208. Based on the selection of the fax key 208, the computer server sends the purchase order to the fax gateway. Therefore, it is clear that Rossmann teaches that the actual information being formatted by the fax gateway (in this case, the fax gateway reads on the server system of the present invention because it receives the requested information from the server 121 and converts it to a fax and sends it to the specified telephone number) as facsimile compatible can correspond directly to the data display on the mobile device. However, Rossmann fails to teach that when the size of the body of further information is greater than is efficiently displayed on the mobile device, then the information is transmitted to a facsimile system functions as an accessible printer device for the mobile device, for printing a hard copy of the information. Smith, in an analogous art, teaches this limitation (see section [0025]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Rossmann so that when the information displayed on the mobile is too big for the mobile device to display, the mobile would then send this information to an accessible printer for the benefit of being able to obtain a hard copy of the information as suggested by Smith. However, Rossmann and Smith, fails to teach printing a hard copy of the information effectively instantaneously as recited in the amended claim. Brown, in an analogous art, teaches a cellular phone capable of receiving fax messages that would be immediately printed out without being required to be stored in a memory (see fig. 6; col. 12, lines 8-

Art Unit: 2618

24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Brown to Rossmann and Smith in order to be able to print a incoming fax message and to efficiently utilize the memory storage.

Regarding claim 12, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the server system as recited in Claim 11 wherein the method further comprises: formatting the information into a form compatible with the mobile device; and sending the information to the mobile device (see Rossmann, Col. 15, lines 6-9).

Regarding claim 15, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the server system as recited in Claim 11 wherein the information comprises a webpage and wherein the accessing comprises receiving a Universal Resource Locator (URL) designating the webpage (see Rossmann, Col .25, lines 20-44).

Regarding claim 16, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the server system as recited in Claim 11 wherein the information is selected from a group consisting of: a webpage, a file, a document, a graphic, a spreadsheet, a databases, e-mail, voice15 to-text, voice-to-e-mail, (see Rossmann, Col. 25, 20-44).

Art Unit: 2618

Regarding claim 17, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the server system as recited in Claim 11 wherein the server system is communicatively coupled to the mobile device via a wireless network (see Rossmann, Fig. 1, item 110).

Regarding claim 18, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the server system as recited in Claim 17 wherein the wireless network includes the Internet (see Rossmann, Fig. 1, item 140).

Regarding claim 19, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the server system as recited in Claim 11 wherein the method further comprises: receiving a facsimile transmission command; and receiving a facsimile number wherein the facsimile system is 5 designated as a transmission destination (see Rossmann, Col. 15, lines 18-20).

Regarding claim 20, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the server system as recited in Claim 1 wherein the transmitting comprises sending the information to a designated facsimile number (see Rossmann, Col. 15, lines 18-20).

Regarding claim 21, Rossmann teaches a method of using a mobile device (Fig. 1, item 100) communicatively coupled to a server system (Fig. 1, item 121 or 131 or 141) for retrieving and communicating information, the method comprising: sending a request for information to the server system (Col. 15, lines 58-67; Col. 16, lines 1-2); receiving at

Art Unit: 2618

the mobile device information responsive to the request (Col. 15, lines 58-67; Col. 16, lines 1-2); displaying data corresponding to the mobile device (Col. 15, lines 6-11); and instructing the server system to transmit the information to a designated facsimile (Col. 15, lines 48-55), wherein responsive to the instructing, the server system: formats the information into a form compatible with facsimile transmission, the formatting performed by the server system; and transmits the information to a facsimile system, the facsimile system comprises a facsimile system in close geographical proximity to the mobile device. In this case, according to Rossmann, once the user receives the purchase order as a card deck from the computer server 121, the user reviews the purchase order and presses the fax key 208. Based on the selection of the fax key 208, the computer server sends the purchase order to the fax gateway. Therefore, it is clear that Rossmann teaches that the actual information being formatted by the fax gateway (in this case, the fax gateway reads on the server system of the present invention because it receives the requested information from the server 121 and converts it to a fax and sends it to the specified telephone number) as facsimile compatible can correspond directly to the data display on the mobile device. However, Rossmann fails to teach that when the size of the body of further information is greater than is efficiently displayed on the mobile device, then the information is transmitted to a facsimile system functions as an accessible printer device for the mobile device, for printing a hard copy of the information. Smith, in an analogous art, teaches this limitation (see section [0025]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Rossmann so that when the information

displayed on the mobile is too big for the mobile device to display, the mobile would then send this information to an accessible printer for the benefit of being able to obtain a hard copy of the information as suggested by Smith. However, Rossmann and Smith, fails to teach printing a hard copy of the information effectively instantaneously as recited in the amended claim. Brown, in an analogous art, teaches a cellular phone capable of receiving fax messages that would be immediately printed out without being required to be stored in a memory (see fig. 6; col. 12, lines 8-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Brown to Rossmann and Smith in order to be able to print a incoming fax message and to efficiently utilize the memory storage.

Regarding claim 23, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the method as recited in Claim 21 further comprising instructing the server system to transmit a webpage (see Rossmann, Col. 25, lines 20-44).

Regarding claim 24, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the method as recited in step 23 wherein the webpage is designated by a corresponding Universal Resource Locator (URL) (see Rossmann, Col. 25, lines 20-44).

Regarding claim 25, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the method as recited in Claim 21 wherein the information is selected from a group consisting of: a webpages, a file, a document, a graphic, a spreadsheet, a database,

e-mail, voice-o-text, voice-to-e-mail, or another electronically formatted data (see Rossmann, Col. 25, lines 20-44).

Regarding claim 26, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the method as recited in Claim 21 wherein the mobile device is communicatively coupled to the server system via a wireless network (see Rossmann, Fig. 1, item 110).

Regarding claim 27, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the method according to Claim 26 wherein the wireless network includes the Internet (see Rossmann, Fig. 1, item 140).

Regarding claim 28, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the method as recited in Claim 21 further comprising: sending a facsimile transmission command; and sending a facsimile number wherein the facsimile system is 20 designated as a transmission destination (see Rossmann, Col. 15, lines 18-20).

Regarding claim 29, Rossmann teaches a computer-usable medium (Fig. 1, item 121 or 131 or 141) having a computer-readable program code (Fig. 7, item 761) embodied therein for causing a computer system to perform a process comprising: accessing an instruction from a mobile device which identifies information to be communicated (Col. 15, lines 58-67; Col. 16, lines 1-2); retrieving the information (Col. 15, lines 6-9); formatting the information into a form compatible with facsimile transmission (Col. 15,

Art Unit: 2618

lines 53-57), wherein the formatting is performed by the server system (Col. 15, lines 48-55); and transmitting the information to a facsimile system (Col. 15, lines 48-55), the facsimile system comprises a facsimile system in close geographical proximity to the mobile device. In this case, according to Rossmann, once the user receives the purchase order as a card deck from the computer server 121, the user reviews the purchase order and presses the fax key 208. Based on the selection of the fax key 208, the computer server sends the purchase order to the fax gateway. Therefore, it is clear that Rossmann teaches that the actual information being formatted by the fax gateway (in this case, the fax gateway reads on the server system of the present invention because it receives the requested information from the server 121 and converts it to a fax and sends it to the specified telephone number) as facsimile compatible can correspond directly to the data display on the mobile device. However, Rossmann fails to teach that when the size of the body of further information is greater than is efficiently displayed on the mobile device, then the information is transmitted to a facsimile system functions as an accessible printer device for the mobile device, for printing a hard copy of the information. Smith, in an analogous art, teaches this limitation (see section [0025]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Rossmann so that when the information displayed on the mobile is too big for the mobile device to display, the mobile would then send this information to an accessible printer for the benefit of being able to obtain a hard copy of the information as suggested by Smith. However, Rossmann and Smith, fails to teach printing a hard copy of the information effectively instantaneously as

recited in the amended claim. Brown, in an analogous art, teaches a cellular phone capable of receiving fax messages that would be immediately printed out without being required to be stored in a memory (see fig. 6; col. 12, lines 8-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Brown to Rossmann and Smith in order to be able to print a incoming fax message and to efficiently utilize the memory storage.

Regarding claim 30, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the computer-usable medium of Claim 29 wherein the computer-readable program code embodied therein causes a computer system to perform a process comprising: formatting the information into a form compatible with the mobile device; and sending the information to the mobile device (see Rossmann, Col. 15, lines 6-9).

Regarding claim 33, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the computer-usable medium as recited in Claim 29 wherein the information comprises a webpage and wherein the computer system further performs receiving a Universal Resource Locator (URL) designating the webpage (see Rossmann, Col. 25, lines 20-44).

Regarding claim 34, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the computer-usable medium as recited in Claim 29 wherein the information is selected from a group consisting of: a webpage, a file, a document, a graphic, a spreadsheet, a

Art Unit: 2618

database, e-mail, voice-to-text, voice-to-e-mail, or another electronically formatted data (see Rossmann, Col. 25, lines 20-44).

Regarding claim 35, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the computer-usable medium as recited in Claim 29 wherein the computer system is communicatively coupled to the mobile device via a wireless network (see Rossmann, Fig. 1, item 110).

Regarding claim 36, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the computer-usable medium as recited in Claim 35 wherein the wireless network includes the Internet (see Rossmann, Fig. 1, item 140).

Regarding claim 37, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the computer-usable medium as recited in Claim 29 wherein the computer-readable program code embodied therein further causes the computer system to perform: receiving a facsimile transmission command; and receiving a facsimile number wherein the facsimile system is designated as a transmission destination (see Rossmann, Col. 15, lines 18-20).

Regarding claim 38, Rossmann teaches a system for retrieving and communicating information (Fig. 1), the system comprising: means for accessing an instruction from a mobile device which identifies information to be communicated (Col. 15, lines 58-67;

Art Unit: 2618

Col. 16, lines 1-2); means for retrieving the information (Col. 15, lines 6-9); means for formatting the information into a form compatible with facsimile transmission (Col. 15, lines 53-57), wherein the formatting means comprises a server (Col. 15, lines 48-55); and means for transmitting the information to a facsimile system according to the instruction (Col. 15, lines 48-55), the facsimile system comprises a facsimile system in close geographical proximity to the mobile device. In this case, according to Rossmann, once the user receives the purchase order as a card deck from the computer server 121, the user reviews the purchase order and presses the fax key 208. Based on the selection of the fax key 208, the computer server sends the purchase order to the fax gateway. Therefore, it is clear that Rossmann teaches that the actual information being formatted by the fax gateway (in this case, the fax gateway reads on the server system of the present invention because it receives the requested information from the server 121 and converts it to a fax and sends it to the specified telephone number) as facsimile compatible can correspond directly to the data display on the mobile device. However, Rossmann fails to teach that when the size of the body of further information is greater than is efficiently displayed on the mobile device, then the information is transmitted to a facsimile system functions as an accessible printer device for the mobile device, for printing a hard copy of the information. Smith, in an analogous art, teaches this limitation (see section [0025]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Rossmann so that when the information displayed on the mobile is too big for the mobile device to display, the mobile would then send this information to an accessible printer for the

benefit of being able to obtain a hard copy of the information as suggested by Smith. However, Rossmann and Smith, fails to teach printing a hard copy of the information effectively instantaneously as recited in the amended claim. Brown, in an analogous art, teaches a cellular phone capable of receiving fax messages that would be immediately printed out without being required to be stored in a memory (see fig. 6; col. 12, lines 8-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Brown to Rossmann and Smith in order to be able to print a incoming fax message and to efficiently utilize the memory storage.

Regarding claim 39, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the system as recited in Claim 38 further comprising: means for formatting the information into a form compatible with the mobile device; and means for sending the information to the mobile device (see Rossmann, Col. 15, lines 6-9).

Regarding claim 40, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the system as recited in Claim 38 wherein the information comprises data displayed on the mobile device (see Rossmann, Col. 15, lines 6-11).

Regarding claim 42, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the system as recited in Claim 39 wherein the information comprises a webpage and

wherein the means further comprises means of receiving a Universal Resource Locator (URL) designating the webpage (see Rossmann, Col. 25, lines 20-44).

Regarding claim 43, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the system as recited in Claim 39 wherein the information is selected from a group consisting of: a webpage, a file, a document, a graphic, a spreadsheet, a database, e-mail, voice-to-text, voice-to-e-mail, or another electronically formatted data (see Rossmann, Col. 25, lines 20-44).

Regarding claim 44, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the system as recited in Claim 39 wherein the system is communicatively coupled to the mobile device via a wireless network (see Rossmann, Fig. 1, item 110).

Regarding claim 45, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the system as recited in Claim 44 wherein the wireless network includes the Internet (see Rossmann, Fig. 1, item 140).

Regarding claim 46, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the system as recited in Claim 38 further comprising: means for receiving a facsimile transmission command; and means for receiving a facsimile (Fax) number wherein the facsimile system is designated as a transmission destination (see Rossmann, Col. 15, lines 18-20).

Regarding claim 47, Rossmann, Smith, Brown and Dervarics once combined teaches the system as recited in Claim 46 further comprising means of transmitting by facsimile to a designated facsimile (Fax) number (see Rossmann, Col. 15, lines 18-20).

Regarding claim 49, the claim recites the limitations as that of claim 1, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

3. Claim 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossmann (US 6,405,037) in view of Smith, II et al. (US 2002/0113994), Brown et al. (US 5,524,047) and further in view of Kato (US 6,775,026).

Regarding claim 48, the rejection of claim 1, as discussed above, over Rossmann, Smith, and Brown is herein incorporated. In addition, Rossmann, Smith, and Brown fails to teach that the formatting is performed by said server system, wherein said facsimile compatible format comprises one or more of the G3 and TIFF protocols. Kato, in an analogous art, teaches a server that receives G3 data, converts into TIFF format and transmits it to a compatible destination (see col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Kato to Rossmann, Smith and Brown in order to enhance the combined system of Rossmann, Smith and Brown to be able to receive and transmit multiple formatted data as taught by Kato.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MINH D. DAO whose telephone number is 571-272-7851. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MATTHEW ANDERSON can be reached on 571-272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2618

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Minh Dao 
AU 2618
July 14, 2006

Matthew Anderson
Supervisor AU 2618

